

pre



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,084	01/08/2001	James H. Waldo	06502.0110-01	6895

22852 7590 09/27/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
1300 I STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

GECKIL, MEHMET B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/755,084	Applicant(s) WALDO ET AL.	
	Examiner Mehmet B. Geckil	Art Unit 2142	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-24 and 26-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-24 and 26-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

1. Claims 8-24 and 26-39 are presented for examination. Applicant should update status of the related applications cited throughout the application.
2. The finality of the last office action is hereby withdrawn and prosecution is reopened.
3. Claims 8, 12-15, 19-26, 30-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pal et al.
4. Pal et al (6,219,675) taught the invention substantially as claimed (e.g., exemplary claim 8) including a database data processing system having a lookup service or database service with associated services, e.g., query service available for use in the data processing system, comprising a navigational agent sending a callback message to a client computer where the callback message requesting a response when the client completed processing (e.g. updating) with a particular database object (col 5, line 23 et seq; col 6, line 57 et seq; and col 7, line 1 et seq.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking and database art at the time of the invention that the claimed invention differed from the teachings of Pal et al only by a degree, e.g. in the claimed lookup service and requesting notification particulars. It is well known to one skill in the art that lookup service as referred in the claims is an obvious variation of the database because databases are used for lookup services or for query services. The meaning of lookup and query are synonymous. For example, everyone knows how

to use Yaahoo and enter a query regarding a person's name or a zip code to receive weather information corresponding to the zip code location. Yahoo looks it up from its database and responds with the matching answer. Moreover, it is well known in the telephone services art to use lookup services of the telephone numbers for decades. Applicant is broadly claiming that when a lookup service is updated, the requesting client should be notified but this is exactly an obvious variation of Pal et al teaching of the callback message requesting a response when the client completed processing. All other variations of notification according to when or while the update occurs are all obvious variations of Pal et al teachings. Furthermore, claims 34-36 recite modifying attributes of the services. This depends on the structure of the database or the lookup service. If the lookup service or database is in object oriented structure then updating involves updating the attributes of the objects of the database. Objects oriented databases are well known in the art for a long time.

5. Claims 9-11, 16-18, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pal et al in view of Hogan et al (5,873,099).

6. Pal et al teachings are incorporated hereinabove. Hogan et al taught adding or associating a new service (col 66, line 42 et seq); disassociating or deleting an existing service (col 66, line 42 et seq.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking and database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Pal et al and Hogan et al because they were both directed updating the database or lookup service and Hogan et al adding and deleting new services to the database would

increase flexibility and functionality of the Pal et al database system. Moreover, Hogan et al Callback functions would mesh nicely with the Pal et al system (see col 47, lines 6-55.)

7. Applicant in the response argued that claims should be interpreted in light of the specification and the specification teaches djini at pages 12-13. Applicant is reminded that examiner has a duty to interpret the claims as broadly as possible in light of the specification and in this light it is no more than a database because functions performed are also performed by the databases as explained in the rejection hereinabove. The central registry or Djinn as applicant argues is not in the claims and applicant's argument is therefore improper. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the network programming and database art to write various variations of the callback taught by Pall et al including callbacks requests originating from the client. Therefore, the rejection is proper. These set of claims are too broad for the issue and read on the prior art systems when interpreted as broadly as possible by the examiner. Claims will be indicated as allowable when the scope of the claims are narrowed down and differentiated clearly from the prior art systems.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2142

Willie et al (6,052,724) taught object oriented directory or lookup service wherein they taught trap object being associated with the directory service event (see col 31, line 15 et seq.)

Arnold et al (6,167,449) taught look-up request accompanied by a call back routine or notifier routine that allows the NSL manager to asynchronously notify the application when a buffer is ready with result data (see col 8, line 37 et seq.) Arnold et al further taught that additional service types other than disclosed by them can be defined and used which allow applications further flexibility (see col 9, line 13 et seq.) This is tantamount to saying that the lookup service or database can be updated by adding new types of services by defining them.

Examiner would like to point out that both Willie et al and Arnold et al specifically used the words "service" in their systems.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mehmet Geckil whose telephone number is (703) 305-9676. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 A.M. to 3:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Jack Harvey, can be reached on (703) 305-9705. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are listed hereinbelow.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700. Customer service number is (703) 306-5631.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Application/Control Number: 09/755,084  
Art Unit: 2142

Page 6

**or faxed to:**

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021  
Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

9/21/04

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mehmet B. Geckil". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**MEHMET B. GECKIL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**